UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,255	03/16/2004	David Maxwell Cannon	SJO920030091US1	2250
45216 Kunzler & McK	7590 09/26/200 Kenzie	EXAMINER		
8 EAST BROA SUITE 600	DWAY	LIM, KRISNA		
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2153	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/801,255	CANNON ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Krisna Lim	2153
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DESTRICTION OF THE MAILING	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 I This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is FINAL . Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac	awn from consideration. or election requirement. er.	Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob-	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat* * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 10/801,255 Page 2

Art Unit: 2153

1. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rezvani et al. [U.S. Patent No. 6,621,827].
- 4. <u>Rezvani</u> disclosed (e.g., see Figs. 1-6) the invention substantially as claimed. Taking claim 1 as an exemplary claim, the reference disclosed an apparatus for adaptive polling of a monitored system (e.g., 28 of Fig. 3), the apparatus comprising:
- a) a poll receiving module (e.g., 49, col. 9 (lines 30-48)) configured to receive a polling signal from a polling system;
- b) an event prediction module configured to predict when an operation-related event (e.g., "state of each connected devices", "checks for commands from server", "N-commands are waiting in the queue", "effect changes", "interval change", "heart beat interval", "events data", "network level activities", col. 9 (lines 57-68), col. 10 (lines 1-7)) of a monitored operation will occur in the monitored system;
 - c) a next polling time determination module configured to determine a next polling

Application/Control Number: 10/801,255

Art Unit: 2153

time based on the prediction (e.g., "state of each connected devices", "checks for commands from server", "N-commands are waiting in the queue", "effect changes", "interval change", "heart beat interval", "events data", "network level activities", col. 9 (lines 57-68), col. 10 (lines 1-5)) of when the operation-related event will occur in the monitored system; and

Page 3

d) a polling response module (e.g., see 214-218 of Fig. 6) configured to communicate the next polling time and monitored system operation information to the polling system.

Rezvani et al. disclosed the monitoring module 28 for polling (50) by scheduling a transmission between the monitoring module 28 and the server 14. Rezvani et al. further disclosed that the monitoring module 14 will poll the server 14 and retrieve data from the server 14 until there are no more commands in the queue. Moreover, Rezvani et al. further disclosed the server 14 to make an internal change to the monitor 28 or to modifying the polling 50 or heartbeat 52 time intervals. While Rezvani et al. further disclosed that the next polling time was based on the result of the determination of these events: "state of each connected devices", "checks for commands from server", "N-commands are waiting in the queue", "effect changes", "interval change", "heart beat interval", "events data", "network level activities", etc., Rezvani et al. did not explicitly mention that the next polling time was based on the prediction of when the operation-related event will occur in the monitored system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to obviously recognize that the result of the determination of those events would have been a prediction of the events to the extent of the claim language.

5. As to claim 2, Rezvani further disclosed the next polling time determination module is further configured to determine the next polling time based on the prediction of when the operation-related event will occur based on network traffic (e.g., "network level activities", col. 9 (lines 57-68), col. 10 (lines 1-7)).

Application/Control Number: 10/801,255 Page 4

Art Unit: 2153

6. As to claim 3, Rezvani further disclosed the next polling time determination module is further configured to determine the next polling time based on the prediction of when the operation-related event will occur and if another operation is executing with a higher priority than the operation, being monitored (e.g., "state of each connected devices", "checks for commands from server", "N-commands are waiting in the queue", "effect changes", "interval change", "heart beat interval", "events data", "network level activities", col. 9 (lines 57-68), col. 10 (lines 1-7)).

- 7. As to claim 4, Rezvani further disclosed the monitored system retains a status of the monitored operation for a period of time after completion of the monitored operation (e.g., "state of each connected devices", "checks for commands from server", "N-commands are waiting in the queue", "effect changes", "interval change", "heart beat interval", "events data", "network level activities", col. 9 (lines 57-68), col. 10 (lines 1-7)).
- 8. As to claim 5, Rezvani further disclosed a polling adjustment module in the polling system configured to adjust the next polling time (e.g., "effect changes", "interval change", col. 9 (lines 57-68), col. 10 (lines 1-7)).
- 9. As to claim 6, Rezvani further disclosed a polling adjustment module configured to adjust the next polling time based on the presence of a user input to the polling system (e.g., "state of each connected devices", col. 9 (lines 57-68), col. 10 (lines 1-7)).
- 10. As to claim 7, Rezvani further disclosed the polling system is a client system (12), and the poll receiving module, event prediction module, next polling time determination module and polling response module are on a server (e.g., see Figs. 2, 5).
- 11. As to claim 8, Rezvani further disclosed n the polling system is a client system (12), and the poll receiving module, event prediction module, next polling time

Application/Control Number: 10/801,255 Page 5

Art Unit: 2153

determination module and polling response module are on a data storage system (e.g., see Figs. 2, 5).

12. Claims 9-20 are similar in scope as of claims 1-8, and therefore claims 9-20 are rejected for the same reasons set forth above for claims 1-8.

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The references are cited in the Form PTO-892 for the applicant's review.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krisna Lim whose telephone number is 571-272-3956. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess, can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ΚI

September

/Krisna Lim/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 215312, 2008